



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

a mystification should offer more conclusive evidence that such a deception was practiced by Chaucer or by the men of his age. It is possible, it seems to me, to find in manuscript-conditions a solution more plausible, and which at least covers all aspects of the difficulty.

The codices of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries frequently contained several or many works, often on kindred subjects, such as the volume described by Chaucer himself in the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*, but not necessarily in the same forms or the same language. Now, one Lollius (Urbicus?), of the third century, wrote a history unknown to us, but which according to Chaucer was of Troy. If we suppose that a composite volume in Chaucer's possession could contain this history of Lollius, duly marked, as (say) its first entry, and contain also, following this, the *Filostrato* of Boccaccio (a romance of Troy), as well as some of Petrarch's sonnets, all unmarked, the attribution of the entire contents by Chaucer to Lollius would be quite natural. If the student be inclined to doubt the existence of Petrarch's or Boccaccio's verse in ms. without the author's name, let him recollect that Petrarch took no pride in his youthful work in the vulgar tongue, believing that his fame would rest on his Latin odes and letters, and that Boccaccio, besides being an ardent admirer of Petrarch's work and opinions, gave the last twenty years of his life mainly to production in Latin. And as for Chaucer's reference (*Monk's Tale*, line 335) to Petrarch as the author of Boccaccio's *De Genealogiis Deorum*, it is no more unlikely that fourteenth century Italian scribes should attribute every elaborate Latin work they handled to Petrarch, the literary arbiter of his time, than that fifteenth century scribes and sixteenth century editors in England should attribute every early English poem they found to Chaucer; or that most fifteenth century poems not plainly marked should now be ascribed to Lydgate.

Even with the sanction of Bradshaw, we can no longer believe that Chaucer deliberately attempted to mystify his readers by apocryphal authorities. The *Wife of Bath's* citations from Ptolemy's *Almagest*, smiled at by Tyrwhitt and dismissed by Skeat, have been proved by Flügel to be genuine quotations from a text equipped with medieval preface and comment; cp. also the ex-

planation of *Agaton* by Paget Toynbee in *Mod. Lang. Quart.* 1, 5. As Lounsbury declares, we have no right to suppose that because a work is lost or unknown to us, it was a myth to Chaucer. The gradual extension of our knowledge as to his reading has thus far shown him speaking and citing each time in good faith.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND.

University of Chicago.

### A RARE COLLECTION OF SPANISH ENTREMESSES.

The book I am about to describe I found in a book-shop at Coimbra. Its rarity may be judged from the fact that Barrera had never seen a copy, nor has it been described, as far as I know, by any bibliographer. Barrera<sup>1</sup> mentions the title of the book on the authority of a manuscript list of plays, made by Gallardo, and he hazards the opinion that the book, *Migajas del ingenio*, may be the same collection as the *Libro de Entremeses de varios Autores*, but a comparison of the two books shows that they have not a single play in common.

This collection, in 8°, is entitled:

*Migajas del ingenio, y apacible entretenimiento, en varios entremeses, bayles, y loas, escogidos de los mejores ingenios de España. Dedicados al Curioso Lector. Con licencia. Impreso por Diego Dormer Impressor de la Ciudad, y del Hospital Real, y General de nuestra Señora de Gracia, de la Ciudad de Zaragoza. A costa de Juan Martinez de Ribera Martel, Mercader de Libros.*

The book bears no date, but it was probably published about 1675, when other collections of the same sort were printed by Diego Dormer.

After the title-page comes the *aprobacion*, then an index of the twenty-two *loas*, *entremeses* and *bayles* contained in the volume, a notice to the *Curioso y Amigo Lector*, and 96 leaves of text. I shall give the first line of each play, to aid in its identification, and shall place an asterisk before the title of the plays that are not mentioned by Barrera.

1. Fol. 1-7: \* *Loa a la festividad de Nuestra Señora del Rosario*. De Don Pedro Francisco Lanini y Sagredo.

*Mus. Las Rosas, las Flores.*

<sup>1</sup> *Catálogo bibliográfico y biográfico del teatro antiguo español*, p. 716.

2. Fol. 7b-10 : \* *Baile de la Entrada de la Comedia*. Por Don Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Arren.* Yo tengo el Arrendamiento.

3. Fol. 10b-14b : \* *Entremes de el Colegio de Gorriones*. De Don Francisco Lanini.

*Mug. 1.* Siendo Iubees de Compadres.

Not mentioned by Barrera among the works of Lanini. He gives the first line of this from a ms. *suelta*, without name of author. *Catálogo*, p. 625.

4. Fol. 15-18 : \* *Bayle de los Mesones*. De Don Francisco Lanini.

*Cant. Apos.* Aposentador de Amor.

5. Fol. 18-24 : *Entremes de la Tía*. De Monteser.

*Azp.* Sepa vuesa merced señor Azcotia.

Mentioned by Barrera as the work of Monteser, *Catálogo*, p. 650. *La Tía* was published in *Entremeses varios, aora nuevamente recogidos de los mejores ingenios de España. En Zaragoza. Por los Herederos de Diego Dormer*.

6. Fol. 24-27b. \* *Loa a la Assumpcion de N. Señora*. De D. Juan de Zavaleta.

*Hom. 1.* Noble Villa de Brunete.

7. Fol. 27b-29b : *Bayle de los Hilos de Flandes*. De Don Pedro Lanini.

*Homb.* Aunque han passado los Reyes.

Mentioned by Barrera as the work of Lanini, *Catálogo*, p. 627. It was published in *Ociosidad entretenida en varios entremeses, bailes, loas y jácaras*, Madrid, 1668.

8. Fol. 30-32 : \* *Bayle de Xacara*. De D. Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Cor.* Que ay Catuja ?

Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 639, mentions a jácara by Matías de Castro with the title, *Pardillo*, the first line of which is the same as the first line of the above. There is a manuscript of *El Pardillo* in the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid, with the date 1677.

9. Fol. 32b-41 : \* *Loa para la Compañía de Feliz Pasqual*. De D. Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Cant.* Vaya de bayle, vaya.

10. Fol. 41b-48 : *Entremes de el Degollado*. De D. Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Ter.* Justicia, aqui de Dios cōtra el Alcalde.

Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 617, attributes this entremes to Lope de Vega, with an interrogation mark. It

was published in *Fiestas del Santissimo Sacramento, repartidas en doce Autos Sacramentales, con sus Loas y Entremeses. Zaragoza, 1644*. In this collection, it is attributed to Lope de Vega. As Lanini's literary activity probably did not date earlier than 1666, if these two versions agree, then the entremes in the *Migajas del ingenio* was written by Lope, and not by Lanini. *El Degollado* was also published in *Entremeses varios, aora nuevamente recogidos de los mejores ingenios de España. En Zaragoza. Por los Herederos de Diego Dormer*. See Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 718.

11. Fol. 48-51 : \* *Bayle del Herrador*. De D. Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Cant. Her.* Herrador soy del amor.

12. Fol. 51b-59b : \* *Loa para la Compañía de Vallejo*. De D. Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Vallejo.* Dexame Carlos.

13. Fol. 59b-64 : \* *Entremes del Dia de san Blas en Madrid*. De D. Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Mug. 1.* Brauo dia de san Blas.

14. Fol. 64-66b : \* *Bayle de los Metales*. De D. Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Cont.* Yo soy contraste de amor.

15. Fol. 67-72b : \* *Loa general para qualquiera fiesta de Comedia*. Name of author not given.

*1.* Calla, que duerme.

This loa was used to introduce Calderon's *La Vida es Sueño*. We read on fol. 72,

*Pint.* Con una comedia oy  
os queremos festejar  
de Don Pedro Calderon  
la vida es sueño será.

16. Fol. 72b-76b : \* *Entremes de la Tataraterá*. De D. Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Hombr. 1.* Ha monote, viue Dios.

17. Fol. 77-79 : \* *Bayle cantado de los Relojes*. De D. Pedro Francisco Lanini.

*Cant. Juez.* A tomar la residencia.

18. Fol. 79b-83 : \* *Entremes famoso de los Escuderos y el Lacayo*. De Benavente.

*Ag.* Quedese la cena, y cama.

Not mentioned by Barrera, nor is it included in the works of Luis Quiñones de Benavente, published in two volumes, in the collection of *Libros de Antaño*, Madrid, 1872-1874.

19. Fol. 83-85b: *Bayle de la Plaza*. De Lanini.

*Cont. Plaça*. La plaça soy de Madrid.

This is the same as *El Bayle de la Plaza de Madrid*, of Lanini, published in the *Ramillete de Saynetes escogidos de los mejores ingenios de España*. *Ympresso en Zaragoza, por Diego Dormer. Año de 1672*. See Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 716.

20. Fol. 85b-91: \* *Entremes de las quantas del desengaño*. De Benavente.

*Desd.* Que esté v. m. señor cuidado.

Not mentioned by Barrera, nor is it included in the works of Luis Quiñones de Benavente, published in the collection of *Libros de antaño*.

21. Fol. 91b-93b: \* *Bayle del Cazador*. De Lanini.

*Cont. Seb.* A caçar paxaros salgo.

22. Fol. 93b-96b: \* *Bayle de la Pelota*. De Lanini.

*Juez.* A jugar a la pelota.

This *bayle* is probably the same as *Pelota*, mentioned by Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 640, as the work of Jacinto Alonso Maluenda. It is found in Vol. I of *Bailes manuscritos* in the library of Sr Fernandez-Guerra.

It will be seen that this collection contains the following works which are not published elsewhere: of Lanini, 3 *loas*, 3 *entremeses*, 8 *bayles*; of Benavente, 2 *entremeses*; of Zabaleta, a *loa*; and a *loa* of unknown authorship. Of these *bayles* ascribed to Lanini, perhaps one is the work of Matías de Castro, and another of Maluenda. It is true that the literary value of many of these pieces is not very great, but they often give us a good idea of the life and manners of the lower elements of Spanish society in the latter part of the seventeenth century. They are of philological value, too, for we find many words used in the *entremeses* and *bayles* which never found their way into the more serious forms of literature. At all events, a description of this collection serves to fill a gap in Barrera's bibliography of Spanish dramatic literature.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

University of Pennsylvania.

#### THE DATE OF *AI* IN *CONNAÎTRE* AND *PARAÎTRE*.

The year 1675 is the date now given for the change from the earlier writing *oi* to the modern *ai* of *connaître* and *paraître*. It was in that year that Bérain, an advocate of Rouen, proposed such a change for the class of words in which the sound written *oi* had the pronunciation of *ε*, a class to which belonged the imperfect and conditional verbal endings, many adjectives of nationality, and a number of other words, including the two verbs in question. Bérain's proposal has been quoted by Rossmann<sup>1</sup> as the date of the introduction of the modern spelling for all the words involved. No one has attempted to show that a distinction is to be made between the various members of the class, and that in *connaître* and *paraître*, at least, the *ai*-writing was freely employed a half century before Bérain proposed it.

Thurot, it is true,<sup>2</sup> cites Duval (1604) as writing *paraistre* by the side of *parestre*, though employing *oi* in the finite forms of this verb. But Thurot is interested in the pronunciation only and indicates no further occurrence of such writing at this time. Unless other examples can be cited, the form must therefore be considered purely sporadic.

Of greater importance is a note by Paul Lacroix, better known as le Bibliophile Jacob,<sup>3</sup> in which he quotes from *Les Aventures Amoureuses d'Omphalle*,<sup>4</sup> by Grandchamp, "fait paraistre de les connaistre moins." The quotation is from the preface of this *tragi-comédie*. Jacob's comment is: "on est surpris en effet, de trouver chez lui l'orthographe de Voltaire, c'est-à-dire l'*a* remplaçant *o*, dans les infinitifs paraître, connaître, et cetera."

Apparently Jacob knew nothing of Bérain and considered the *ai*-writing sporadic before Voltaire, for he makes no further reference to its occurrence. Had he looked further, however, into not only this play, but others of the same period, he would have found the *ai* established as a frequent, if not preponderant writing alongside the older *oi*-form.

<sup>1</sup> *Romanische Forschungen*, 1883, page 173.

<sup>2</sup> *Prononciation française*, Vol. I, p. 389.

<sup>3</sup> *Bibliothèque dramatique de M. de Soleinne*, Vol. I, p. 226.

<sup>4</sup> Paris, 1630, in 8°.